

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 899

SP 032 459

AUTHOR Levin, Robert A.
TITLE Education Schools in Search of a Mission: The Preparation of Elementary Teachers at a Large University and a Normal School/State College, 1905-1945.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 90
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; *Educational Trends; *Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Preservice Teacher Education; Social Change; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the findings of a study focused upon faculty, curricula, and field work in the preparation of elementary teachers during the early years of programs at the University of Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania) and Keen State College (New Hampshire). Distinct patterns in program missions were found that could be studied in context, considering both the history of educational thought and broader social, economic, and demographic trends in the United States. Distinct values about what teacher candidates should know, consider, and do--in the classroom and the community--were periodically evident in the institutions' curricula between 1905 and 1940. Significant efforts to integrate general, professional, and field studies also characterized portions of the 1910-1935 period at both institutions. Program developments tended to coincide with historical periods in which the themes expressed in teacher education mirrored larger social or political trends or events. During the 1930s, however, programs for elementary candidates at both places began to become homogenized, dominated by the evolving hegemony of a four-year liberal arts model of collegiate education. A conclusion is that careful assessment of which efforts accomplished what goals in the history of teacher education is likely to contribute to informed policy choices in the years to come.
(Author/JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED320899

EDUCATION SCHOOLS IN SEARCH OF A MISSION:
THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AT
A LARGE UNIVERSITY AND A NORMAL SCHOOL/STATE COLLEGE,
1905-1945

Robert A. Levin
Carnegie-Mellon University

Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, presented April 19, 1990.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. A. Levin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

SP032459

This paper presents portions of the author's doctoral research, conducted during 1988-1990, while completing work for the Doctor of Arts Degree in History at Carnegie-Mellon University. The completed dissertation will be on file in the C-MU library and Department of History by August 1990, and in the libraries of the two case-study institutions shortly thereafter. While today's presentation covers the time period 1905-1945, the full dissertation continues through to 1980.

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to:

--Members of the author's dissertation committee: Daniel P. Resnick, chair and primary adviser; Steven Schlossman, co-adviser; and Edwin Fenton;

--Archivists and faculty contact-persons at the case-study institutions, in particular Rebecca Abromitis and Richard Seckinger at the University of Pittsburgh and Robert Madden, Delina R. Hickey, and David E. Costin, Jr., at Keene State College;

--A.E.R.A. Division F Program Chair John Rury for suggesting that the study be proposed for presentation here, and Co-Chair Roberta Wollons for providing invaluable suggestions. Also John I. Goodlad for inviting me to join in related research for his Study of the Education of Educators, which greatly enriched this study, and William R. Johnson and Jurgen Herbst for the insights of their own published work and their kind responses to my inquiries.

A final note of thanks is extended to those scholars at the case-study institutions and elsewhere, who are now reviewing completed drafts of dissertation chapters, in search of any remaining errors of fact or judgment.

Robert A. Levin
April 1990

EDUCATION SCHOOLS IN SEARCH OF A MISSION:
THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AT
A LARGE UNIVERSITY AND A NORMAL SCHOOL/STATE COLLEGE,
1905-1945

Robert A. Levin
Carnegie-Mellon University

Abstract: Two historically distinct institutions -- a large, comprehensive university and a former normal school/teachers college -- initiated the preparation of elementary teachers early in this century in notably different ways, in the context of their larger institutional missions. Clear, though changeable, philosophies guided program structures and practices at the normal school *into* the 1930s, and at the university especially *during* the 1930s. Distinct values about what teacher-candidates should know, consider, and do -- in the classroom and the community -- periodically were evident in the institutions' curricula between 1905 and 1940. Significant efforts to integrate general, professional, and field studies also characterized portions of the 1910-1935 period at both institutions. Program developments tended to coincide with historical periods in which the themes expressed in teacher education mirrored larger social or political trends or events. During the 1930s, however (early at the normal school and later at the university), programs for elementary candidates at both places began to become homogenized, dominated by the evolving hegemony of a four-year liberal-arts "model" of collegiate education. These homogenized programs contributed to a demise of once-coherent (if differing and debatable) visions of the role of an elementary teacher as a public educator in a democracy. Understanding the historical roots of this blurred sense of mission may shed light on program and policy debates about the essential components of renewed teacher education in the 1990s.

Teacher education reform in the United States in the 1980s appeared as the second coming of Sputnik. The late 1950s and 60s had spawned landmark reports of the allegedly dumbed-down state of teacher education (1), in the wake of the Soviet Union's first-ever successful

launching of a space satellite in 1957. While overcoming the Russians was one rallying call of that era, overcoming the Japanese, particularly in the areas of technology education and economic productivity, contributed to the U.S. Department of Education's A Nation at Risk in 1983, followed by two major national reports on teacher education (2).

The fundamentally ahistorical nature of these crisis-oriented blueprints for change troubled certain thoughtful observers and teacher educators. One such commentator was Seymour Sarason, co-author of a book called The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education. The book was published originally in 1968 and recently revised (3). Himself a student and teacher of professional education and school change, Sarason, in his recent update, repeated his claim that teacher education had been widely criticized but not seriously studied. Comparing today's reform climate to the 50s and 60s, he asked, "How do we avoid making the same mistakes about the same recommendations?" (4) In fact, certain recommendations, such as calls for graduate-level-only teacher preparation, and cutting or changing so-called "methods" courses, actually trace their roots at least as far back as the 1930s at both institutions in my study (5).

This study was conceived in sympathetic response to Sarason's critique, and grounded as well in my own experiences as a teacher, administrator, and teacher educator which taught me to be skeptical about simple solutions to complex educational problems. It is a comparative case analysis of the two different kinds of teacher-preparing institutions which have dominated the profession in this century: (I) the large, comprehensive, and increasingly research-driven (6) university, and (II) the regional public normal school / turned teachers college / turned state college which began exclusively for teacher training (7). The major reason for setting up such a comparative study was to test a hypothesis: that historical differences in an institution's overall mission might have played an important role in defining a particular mission or philosophy in the education of educators.

As the study proceeded, it became clear that defining and maintaining a "mission" in teacher education at both institutions was elusive; the clarity and coherence of their missions faded in and out

over the decades like radio reception of a distant station late at night. And thus the title of this paper, indicating the ongoing search for a mission -- a search pursued more or less vigorously at different points in the institutions' histories. This study, I hoped, would yield specific historical data about three things -- faculty, curricula, and field work (student teaching and otherwise) -- as illustrations of intention and purposefulness in two selected teacher education programs. Without serious and specific study of what had been tried, for what purposes, and with what outcomes, new efforts to change the direction of teacher education would seem to be navigating without a map.

Before reviewing some of the study's findings, additional brief introductory remarks on the design of the study will be helpful.

The chosen institutions were, in the university category, the University of Pittsburgh in Pennsylvania, and in the former normal school category, Keene State College in New Hampshire. Particularly important institutional types *not* chosen, for various considerations in the research design, were historically black public normal schools and major private universities. Also not chosen were two other significant but much smaller groups of institutions in the teacher-education enterprise, private normals, and private liberal-arts colleges, black and white. I am pleased to be able to mention in the footnotes some excellent recent work on these various types of institutions (8).

Finally by way of introduction, the study is focussed upon faculty, curricula, and field work in the preparation of elementary teachers during the first 70 years of Pittsburgh's and Keene's programs. Both the time frame, and the focus on the elementary level, made it possible to find distinct patterns in program missions that could be studied in context, considering both the history of educational thought, and broader social, economic, and demographic trends in the United States.

Today's time constraints will permit only a brief discussion of the curriculum, including field work, in the Elementary Education programs at Keene and Pittsburgh from 1905-1945. I will also refer to ways in which issues the institutions faced in those years resurfaced during the 1960s and 70s. Data collected on how the changing nature of the faculty influenced programs will be briefly noted.

The Search for a Mission Through Course Work: Founding Periods

The founding and formative periods of education programs at both Pittsburgh and Keene occurred during the period 1905-1925. Keene Normal School developed a curriculum intimately tied to its founding mission of serving the rural and village elementary schools of southwestern New Hampshire. The University of Pittsburgh's School of Education, while tied from its beginnings much more clearly to a university and research tradition, nevertheless offered departments and courses similar to normal schools for more than a decade.

The Western University of Pennsylvania first offered education courses in 1904-5, four years before it became known as the University of Pittsburgh and six years before the Trustees established professional schools including a School of Education. Its conception of an Education curriculum was a distinctly university one; courses called "Educational Psychology and Education" and the "History of Education and Educators" followed a pattern seen at other public and private universities which mounted educational studies as spinoffs of existing academic disciplines. Western University's courses particularly emphasized the new field of "child study" connected to the work of psychologist G. Stanley Hall at Clark University, as well as such aspects of Progressive pedagogical practice as manual training and nature study.

In 1909, a former student of Hall's, Will Grant Chambers, came to what was then called the University of Pittsburgh, and became the first dean of the new School of Education in 1910. Chambers' own background was a mix of academic and professional traditions of the time. His first collegiate diploma was from Pennsylvania's Central State Normal School, followed by a liberal-arts degree from Lafayette College and graduate work at Clark and the University of Chicago, the latter a few years before John Dewey's laboratory school was established there. The School of Education under Chambers placed itself immediately and distinctly in one particular "camp" of university schools of education -- the camp associated with a comprehensive, strong-on-methodology curriculum in a range of elementary and secondary regular-classroom and specialist subjects. Unlike major national universities which moved quickly to post-baccalaureate studies for school administrators by the late 1910s, and away from teacher preparation, Pittsburgh educated significant

numbers of teachers generally at the undergraduate level. The College of Education admitted juniors after they had completed two years in the College of Arts and Sciences (9). Pittsburgh was among the first half of the 105 American university schools of education that had been established by 1934 (10).

The Elementary Education curriculum at Pittsburgh in the first decade was a blend of university and normal-school traditions. It called for extensive foreign-language, mathematics, and science work, plus a large humanities distribution component and a required 10-hour "academic" minor. Students majored in Elementary Education, and their choice of a B.A. or B.S. degree track determined the required mix of science versus humanities courses. The professional education requirements carried a split personality: sixteen credits in traditional foundations areas taught by senior faculty, and a variety of full-year, subject-specific methods courses carrying two credits per semester (in "language," geography, reading/literature, "number," etc.), taught by junior and part-time faculty.

In theory, Pittsburgh grounded this program in the belief that candidates could and should learn to think about significant foundational issues, and apply them to a range of methodological skills, all in the context of a demanding general-studies background. The four-year agenda for elementary candidates was highly prescribed, beginning with two years of course work strictly in the College of Arts and Sciences and then continuing in the School of Education. Program documents leave the distinct impression, however, that the professional-education twain did not meet -- that foundations courses existed to impart a body of information, while fragmented methods courses offered the "how to," but no one was assigned the responsibility of integrating the why and the how. Nor was it clear where, or if, the Elementary department stood on Progressive pedagogical approaches in circulation at the time. A separate Childhood Department within the School of Education offered a much more explicit and coherent "Deweyian" rationale for its curriculum, but no such message came from the Elementary program. Thus it seems fair to say that the Elementary Department had a start on a clear sense of mission, but did not appear to have executed it in a way that would create integration for the learners.

In a flurry of what it considered fluff-cutting and budget-cutting in 1921, the University of Pittsburgh simply eliminated most vestiges of normal-school-looking Education programs. This deletion of programs included all those related to industrial and domestic training, as well as the Elementary Education and Childhood departments. Not surprisingly, Dean Chambers was not around by 1923 when a newly-designed Elementary department reappeared. For the remainder of the 20s, Elementary Education could only be a major "by permission of the Dean." Methods courses were reduced and consolidated, and reconceptualized in a child-psychology framework with specific reference to the work of E.L. Thorndike and others. All the old foundations-course requirements for elementary candidates were gone, replaced by one three-credit "Problems of Teaching in the Elementary School." One course recalling Dewey, "The Problem and Project Methods," was an advanced undergraduate elective but otherwise a graduate course, forecasting a subsequent pattern at Pittsburgh from the late 1930s on of offering "big issues" courses to administrative candidates and graduate students, but methodology courses to teacher candidates. In arts and sciences courses for Elementary candidates, the humanities requirements survived largely intact, but there were major reductions in math and science requirements. The Elementary Department seemed to be putting forth two statements of purpose during the 1920s: (I) that the new developmental psychology was the most scholarly and appropriate framework for elementary candidates to learn their craft, and (II), that neither too much concern with larger pedagogical or social issues, or too much time in methods courses, served their students as well as a good-old academic major. An additional message, unfortunate if true, may have been that the female student body in Elementary Education, and/or the elementary child, did not need or could not handle much math and science.

The founding period at Keene Normal School presents a much more focussed notion of what a so-called "Normal Girl" (11) should learn and prepare to do on the job. For one thing, Keene differed significantly from Pittsburgh in that, from its founding in 1909 until 1963, it was governed by the New Hampshire State Department of Education, in effect as part of the state's public elementary and secondary school system. This meant that the state-designed curricula for each elementary grade

corresponded directly to the subject matter covered in the Normal School's courses, especially prior to 1933. Keene Normal's founder in 1909 was Henry C. Morrison, the state Superintendent of Public Instruction who had been working since 1904 to modernize, and bring accountability to, the state's grade-school system. Morrison's major goal was to centralize three aspects of rural education -- the curriculum, supervision of school operations, and teacher preparation -- for New Hampshire's hundreds of one- and two-room rural schools. He and his colleagues and successors vigorously pursued this goal and achieved dramatic results over a 25-year period. To illustrate, in 1922, despite the long-time existence of Plymouth Normal School, and the newer Keene's presence for 13 years, only 15% of the state's one-room rural schoolhouses were staffed by a teacher who possessed at least a two-year normal-school certificate. At the same time, New Hampshire's village elementary schools employed 50% certified teachers, while city elementary schools had 80%. By 1928, just six years later, the percent of certified rural teachers had nearly quadrupled, to 55%, while village ratios increased to 70%. By 1930, the rural figure had reached nearly 75%. (12)

Although Keene experimented briefly with a one-year certificate program, its standard fare for elementary candidates from 1909 to 1933 was a two-year program, with an admissions requirement of graduation from an accredited New Hampshire high school (13). The normal-school week was organized much like a secondary school, with 27 class periods weekly until the student-teaching term. The Elementary curriculum, as it had evolved by 1923-24, carried requirements generally as follows:

--15% foundational/general studies. An initial History of Education course was later replaced by Introduction to Education, paralleling a change in priorities seen at Pittsburgh. Educational psychology which emphasized "the functional rather than the structural side of the subject...of child nature" was a six-credit staple. As the Normal School deepened its vision of, and commitment to, preparing young women to take over one-room rural schoolhouses, a Rural Sociology course came into the curriculum and remained through the 1930s;

--25% in the content areas of school subjects, including English, Geography, Arithmetic, and History & Civics, in particular. Course content came from state guidelines and current practices in the local

schools. These courses served the dual function of reviewing and remediating in the subjects, and also teaching the planning of lessons and activities for the various elementary grades. Given the diverse high-school preparation of Keene's students, it may be assumed that the review and remediation function was not small or unimportant;

--35% "hands-on" courses, including manual and domestic arts and activity-based music and art. This was a centerpiece of New Hampshire's normal-school philosophy, and it had three components. First, the state believed that children, especially in rural areas, needed to learn functional life skills and clean and cultured habits and tastes. Second, the normal school emphasized training its young women to be able to handle all manner of duties in the rural school, from decorating the room, to handling repairs, to tending the garden and grounds. This was teacher education for a total immersion, rural experience. It was also tied to a mix of gender-based beliefs, about "women's work" generally as well as the particular role of women social servants during the Progressive Era. Third, and probably least strong in influence, was some vestige of sympathy for Deweyian progressives who preached that children learn best through products and processes that illustrate academic concepts, such as cooking as a route to learning mathematics, and arts and toolmaking as vehicles for understanding ancient cultures.

--Finally, 25% of the founding-era Elementary curriculum was taken up with student teaching, an area to be discussed shortly.

To summarize the founding periods at Pittsburgh and Keene, each Elementary program evolved directly from the institution's larger sense of identity. Pittsburgh was committed to serving the educational needs of its home city and surrounding communities, and thus remained willing to prepare large numbers of elementary teachers, but not in programs perceived as too strong on professional studies. Keene Normal School's identity was tightly bound up with gender-bound notions of the role of young women as elementary educators, and class-bound notions of what rural children needed, along with a generous mix of idealism about upgrading the professionalism of New Hampshire public education.

The Curriculum Between 1925 and World War II

Both institutions dramatically reassessed their programs and priorities during this period. Pittsburgh became, between about 1931 and 1936, a very different kind of Elementary Education department -- a multi-faceted university-style teachers college -- in some ways "out-normaling" the normal schools. The change did not last. Keene Normal School began a hasty retreat from its hands-on-oriented two-year program. By 1933 it moved to a three-year Elementary certificate, expanding to a four-year Bachelor of Education program and official State Teachers College status by 1939. Although teacher education remained its sole stated function, Keene's emulation of the liberal-arts college model subsumed professional studies in a way that watered down its philosophical and social orientation.

First, the Pittsburgh story.

In the 1930s, the University of Pittsburgh School of Education attempt to create a four-year, integrated faculty and program of liberal and professional studies for teacher candidates. Although the School's first dean had lobbied for a four-year curriculum, the University had not allowed it. In 1931, the School of Education graduated nine times the number of baccalaureate candidates than in 1917 -- 272 compared to 31 -- with approximately 40 of those in Elementary Education. Joining the 18 Education faculty (including three senior-rank and one junior-rank in the Elementary department) were, by 1935, some 28 arts-and-sciences faculty members with appointments in their speciality disciplines, ranging from physics and zoology to history, politics, English, and even accounting and journalism, to name a few. This was an effort to address Education Dean Seig's belief that the School of Education had become too exclusively professional, isolated, and low in status on the campus, while the College of Arts and Sciences "included little or no recognition that the students in (their) courses were preparing themselves later to teach..."

The Elementary curriculum called for an original configuration of foundations and methods courses, including at least two courses which attempted to integrate these areas: (I) "The Organization of Curriculum Materials," which dealt with developing "curricula by the use of...methods of science and social theory...on the basis of psychology

and the democratic movement," and (II) "Supervision and Direction of Study," which was "an analysis of the activities involved in study" with methodological implications for classroom objectives and assignments. These courses attempted to address Dean Seig's concern that methods courses, while essential, were empty exercises unless candidates inquired into the rationales and alternative approaches for learning school subjects. Although no cause-effect relationship is clear, Pittsburgh's emphasis on foundational issues occurred during the same period as Depression-era social critiques that entered the literature of professional education (14).

The curriculum also required Elementary majors to carry two 18-credit minors in subject-fields, along with what had become fairly standard general-education requirements (though with less foreign language).

One drawback to this stimulating experiment was that this was a four-and-a-half year program hiding not so cleverly in a four-year robe. Certain required courses tended to show up only in a summer session. Pittsburgh began a long tradition of under-counting its credits of professional requirements by anywhere from 30 to 50%. The requirements they tended not to compute in their official version of program components included: (I) an already under-credited student-teaching block; (II) the summer art- and music-methods courses and (III) an introductory psychology course, in the program's stated version of necessary credits. This trick is by no means unique to Pittsburgh, then or now; these things seem to have much to do with university politics and keeping the advertised size of majors within certain limits.

By 1937, the experiment was in trouble, and by 1941, it was nearly dead. Discipline-based faculty returned to their former homes in arts and sciences. The Education faculty wondered whether it had gone too far in trying to merge theory with practice, and once again moved its "big issues" or integrative-type professional courses back to the graduate level. Again, the historical context of this shift is curious if not causal; the country's entry into World War II led to a general decline of social-critique-oriented work. Talk of trying to bring back the departed faculty raised concerns about an assured "rebellion" in the College of Arts and Sciences. Apparently the different constituencies

and sources of esteem and promotion between the liberal and professional faculty overwhelmed this philosophically-coherent and programmatically-integrated curriculum experiment.

Ironically, Keene Normal School spent these same years of transition to Teachers College status safely isolating professional studies in the junior and senior years, slashing its hands-on curriculum by 70%, cutting foundations credits, turning grade-school-sounding content classes into courses with collegiate titles, and enlarging the share of those content courses to 55% of the total Elementary program requirements. As noted below, field work also took a beating in this university-izing of the normal-school catalogue. Throughout this period, College documents proclaimed a unique "vocational attitude" and special, teaching-oriented "point of view" proffered in such courses as "Classics in Translation" and "History of Civilization." It was not an easy argument to buy, however, particularly as it related to the preparation of elementary teachers. This was due to the nature of the new courses, and that, while most faculty were hired with secondary-school experience, few had ever worked in elementary schools (15).

By the 1940s, Keene scaled back its new arts-and-sciences thrust a bit, substituting a war-era course in "Contemporary European History" for the civilization course, and "Children's Literature" for the classics course. Rather than adding discipline-specific science courses as it had begun in the 30s, the College instead expanded general science and nature study by way of continuing its expansion of science requirements. It also restored half of the previously-reduced course work in music and art, in the two areas of so-called "appreciation" courses and in studio/methodology courses. In these ways, Keene appeared to recapture some measure of its earlier focus on the elementary classroom.

To summarize the 1925-1945 period of course work at Pittsburgh and Keene:

Pittsburgh's frontal assault on one of teacher education's most stubborn problems -- making meaningful connections between general and professional studies -- led to a brief adoption of a 4-year teachers college structure. But with rising expectations for faculty credentials and research activity, and perhaps also a short-lived broader intellectual climate focussed on social critique and reform, joint

appointments in arts-and-sciences and education did not sufficiently suit the university culture to survive. Even within the School of Education itself, faculty concerned with merging foundational issues and methodology had trouble convincing their colleagues that this was an appropriate or attainable direction to take with undergraduates -- recall the faculty's 1940 concern about "too much theory."

Keene Normal School/Teachers College remained under the New Hampshire State Department of Education during this period. There appear to have been at least two major motivations behind its drive to look and sound like a general-purpose four-year college. First, as Jurgen Herbst has documented (16), the regional teachers college was viewed by state legislators and their constituents as higher education's open door, with low or free tuition and accessibility to a wide range of students. My own hypothesis is that this was the most significant of the two factors for change (17), even though the New Hampshire teachers colleges remained in the advertised, exclusive business of preparing teachers for decades longer than comparable institutions in other parts of the country. Second, the state continued to be concerned about strengthening the preparation of teachers and the program of studies to children.

I would like to move now to a brief consideration of how field work evolved at each institution.

Under Dean Chambers during Pittsburgh's founding period, the Elementary Education department designed field work under what came to be known as the "Pittsburgh Plan." This is how it worked. Juniors entering the School of Education served a full-year, four-credit apprenticeship in the schools, for five half-days per week. In the first semester, the candidates observed and assisted; in the second semester, they also had to teach, under supervision, for at least one hour per day. Seniors student-taught all year, again for half-days, with supervised teaching responsibilities five days per week, for eight credits. Most placements were in the Pittsburgh city schools. The Pittsburgh Plan was cited by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1913 as a model program that had been adopted by other institutions. It represented a philosophically-coherent notion of how candidates should receive gradual induction into

classroom "realities" alongside foundational and methodological studies. The chancellor of the University declared his vision that the Pittsburgh Plan would lead to a network of what he called "model schools" as collaborative ventures between the School of Education and the Pittsburgh Public Schools. With the exception of a seven-year period from 1969-1976, however, no such formal collaboration came to pass between the University and any public-school districts. Later this morning in the discussion portion of our program, we may wish to take up factors which encourage or discourage extensive field-work experiences in teacher education programs.

In proportion to the length of its program, Keene Normal School in its founding period placed a similar emphasis on field work. Students spent the first of their four semesters going with their classes to observe lessons being taught in Keene elementary schools. In the second semester, they tutored individual students. In the third semester, they led small-group instruction in local classrooms. In the final semester, they student-taught for 29 hours per week. Students also frequently worked as substitute teachers in neighboring towns, and the Normal School periodically granted its students four-week leaves of absence, in what it called "relays" or shifts, for this purpose, also providing supervision. There is a fascinating history of Keene Normal School's complete ownership of, and near-expulsion in 1921 from, all 14 Keene public elementary schools. There is another fascinating story of the Keene Rural Cadet program, in which candidates lived and worked in 9-week shifts for student teaching in rural one-room schools -- a program which placed as many as 65 elementary candidates per year from 1924 to about 1933. Time does not permit more detailed remarks on these early collaborative relationships with school districts, except to say that they were by far Keene's largest-scale collaborative efforts in the College's history, and, as with the Pittsburgh Plan, represented purposeful visions of teacher induction which extended across several terms of a program.

Neither institution could, or elected to, sustain this level of field work beyond the early 1920s. In principle, then and since, faculty at both places wanted early and gradual induction for candidates into the professional workplace -- for reasons of both screening and training. In

practice, however, field work was a large and easy target for consumption by other campus priorities. Keene's Elementary student teaching was reduced to nine weeks, and after the end of the Rural Cadet program, was housed primarily in the one local elementary school it still operated, the Wheelock lab school. Wheelock had long played a key role as a model and demonstration school, though not really as an experimental or research-oriented "lab." Pre-student-teaching observation credits were also eliminated. Generally in the 1930s and 40s, student teachers at Wheelock worked in pairs. Although this was intended by the College only as a stop-gap measure due to a lack of placement sites, some Wheelock faculty considered it an educationally superior approach, for reasons we may wish to discuss later. It never reappeared in the program.

Pittsburgh cut back even more sharply in the 1930s. Initially, candidates student-taught for three hours per day for one semester, and six credits. This was cut to two hours per day as the faculty reported it was "impossible to schedule practice teachers for three hours even if we wanted to," presumably due to the full on-campus course schedule required of students.

Field Work: An Afterword

In the post-World War II baby boom, demands for student-teaching placements at both institutions grew to such a degree that the record appears to be one of coping with numbers rather than refining collaborative arrangements with school districts. Not until the 1970s did both institutions initiate promising new programs for practitioner-college collaboration -- Pittsburgh in a well-developed network of teaching centers around the metropolitan area, and Keene in an exchange program with a college and so-called "open" schools in England. The Pittsburgh program in particular served as precisely the kind of model many states, universities, and schools have talked about but not achieved. But again, as with joint faculty appointments in the 1930s, the kiss of death for these field programs was the momentum of separate constituencies and divergent priorities.

Concluding Remarks

The challenge of teacher-education reform in the 1990s is not to add a semester of this or a year of that. The historical record offers examples, whether incomplete and outmoded or still usable, of programs that offered a vision of how component parts fit together to form a coherent curriculum. These were programs in which purpose preceded course specifications. The record is far from clean, in fact demonstrating how elusive it was to determine, attain, and retain a program driven by purpose. The record also suggests that teacher-education programs did not develop an identity apart from larger social movements and concerns of a given period, nor did such historically-influenced identities seem to survive changing political or social winds. In part for that reason, holding fast to philosophically-grounded programs seemed particularly difficult for teacher education, at least as suggested by these two case studies. Neither were these programs immune from the growing influence of the liberal-arts model of baccalaureate education on professional education programs generally.

The University of Pittsburgh and Keene State College grappled with these issues at various points in the period covered here. Careful assessment of which efforts accomplished what goals in the history of teacher education is likely to contribute to informed policy choices in the years to come.

NOTES

1. See, for example, James Bryant Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963) and James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963). A useful discussion of these and other critiques of the period may be found in William R. Johnson, "Teachers and Teacher Training in the Twentieth Century," in Donald Warren, ed., American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work. A publication of the American Educational Research Association (New York: MacMillan, 1989), 238-242.

2. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (New York: The Carnegie Forum, 1986) and The Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers (East Lansing, Mich.: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986).

3. Seymour Sarason, Kenneth S. Davidson, and Burton Blatt, The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education, Revised Edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Brookline Books, 1986). Also note that Sarason's The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, while not the most accessible writing on the subject, is widely considered one of the most insightful works regarding the persistence of conservative practices in public education. Sarason has also written a new and personal book on attempting to facilitate institutional change.

4. Ibid., in the Introduction to the Revised Edition.

5. This is also true of other institutions. See Robert A. Levin, "29 Places: A Historical Perspective," in John I. Goodlad, ed., Places Where Teachers Are Taught (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, forthcoming Fall 1990).

6. The large, comprehensive, increasingly research-driven university in this study, the University of Pittsburgh, was a private institution until it obtained "state-related" status in 1963. Like other once private, now state-related Pennsylvania institutions such as Temple University in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh has long served a primary mission of service to the professional and business needs of its metropolitan area, with an increasing emphasis on academic research.

7. The types of institutions fall into general, but not rigid or precise, categories. Conant (1963, op. cit.) and Goodlad (1990, ibid.) employed certain categories to facilitate the organization and analysis of their respective nationwide studies. In the present study, the University of Pittsburgh may be viewed historically as a "regional/comprehensive" university that has evolved toward "national/research" status during the second half of this century. Keene State College stands as a member of the ex-normal school, ex-teachers college, now regional state college category, though that group of institutions, too, took at least two divergent roads -- those that became comprehensive, regional universities (spread over a very wide time span from the late-19th century through the 1970s), and those like Keene that remained teacher-preparatory until much more recently, as discussed in the text of this paper.

The term "normal school," for those readers unfamiliar with its roots, does not connote normality, but came from France, through Prussia, to Massachusetts in the early 19th century, and was what the French called their schools for preparing teachers. When the state of Illinois opened a "normal university" for teaching and other fields in 1857, it named the town, Normal, after the school.

8. See, for example, Kathleen Cruikshank's chapter on the history of black and white teacher education in the state of Georgia in the forthcoming Goodlad (1990) volume, *op. cit.*, as well as other chapters organized by institutional-types in that volume. On the history of black teacher education, see in particular James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), as well as Linda Perkins, "The History of Blacks in Teaching: Growth and Decline Within the Profession," in Donald Warren, ed., *op. cit.* Wayne E. Fuller's chapter in the Warren volume discusses rural teaching and schooling for blacks and whites, material that also bears upon the subject of teacher education.

The now definitive work on colleges of education in major research universities is Geraldine Joncich Clifford and James W. Guthrie, Ed School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988).

The two older standard works, providing an overview of the history of teacher education, are Merle L. Borrowman, The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education (Westport, Conn.: The Greenwood Press, 1977 reissue of 1956 Teachers College Press edition), and Walter S. Monroe, Teaching-Learning Theory and Teacher Education 1890-1950 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969 reissue of 1952 Univ. of Illinois Press edition).

Newer "standards" providing broad histories of teacher education include Jurgen Herbst, And Sadly Teach (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), chapters by Herbst and William R. Johnson in the Donald Warren volume, and Zhixin Su, "Teacher Education in the United States," Occasional Paper, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, University of Washington, Seattle, 1986. A.E.R.A.'s Division F heard a useful paper of this sort eleven years ago: B.J. Benham, "Teacher Training: The Futile 135-Year Search for a Foolproof Formula" (AERA annual meeting in San Francisco, 1979).

Although not a topic of much serious scholarship between the early 1950s and the mid-1980s, the history of teacher education, and its implications for current policies and practices, has entered somewhat of a Renaissance in very recent years. Who is out there listening -- and, of course, whom historians are serious about reaching -- remains to be seen.

9. Not all large, public universities began by separating teacher-preparation out into the junior and senior years. Walter S. Monroe (*op. cit.*) discusses variations in School of Education admission practices at such institutions as Michigan and Ohio State in the early part of this century.

10. Ibid.

11. This term comes from the Report of the Superintendent of Schools, in the Report of the Board of Education of Union School District of the City of Keene, N.H., From March 10, 1921 to March 10, 1922, page 12. (Filed in the office of the Superintendent of Schools, Keene, N.H.)

12. Data cited in Harry Alvin Brown, Certain Basic Teacher-Education Policies and Their Development in a Selected State (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).

13. Unfortunately for the Normal School's curriculum planners, a student could graduate from a New Hampshire high school in that era with a one-, two-, three-, or four-year diploma, making it even more difficult than would be predictable to assume what the student might already know upon matriculation.

14. See, for example, Herbert M. Kliebard and Greg Wegner, "Harold Rugg and the Reconstruction of the Social Studies Curriculum: The Treatment of the 'Great War' in his Textbook Series," in Thomas S. Popkewitz, ed., The Formation of the School Subjects (New York: Falmer Press, 1987).

15. William R. Johnson has argued that teachers colleges generally did not do anywhere near as much specialized crafting of the liberal-arts curriculum as they claimed or has often been assumed. See Johnson as cited in Donald Warren, ed., op. cit., in footnote 1.

16. Jurgen Herbst, "Teacher Preparation in the Nineteenth Century," in Donald Warren, ed., op. cit. This is also the theme of the official history of Keene State College: James G. Smart, Striving: Keene State College 1909/1984. The History of a Small Public Institution (Canaan, N.H.: Phoenix Publishing, 1984).

17. In the late 1940s, State Board of Education data showed that the two teachers colleges, Plymouth and Keene, were enrolled the only gender-balanced student bodies of any public or private college in the state, with 500 students at Keene and 300 at Plymouth. The University of New Hampshire enrolled more women at 850, but more than three times the number of men than women. Dartmouth College enrolled more men than U.N.H., but no women, and was, of course, relatively expensive. Two small private colleges were all female, and one almost exclusively male. This offers additional evidence of the teachers colleges' importance as institutions of higher learning, access, and economic mobility in the state, not just as places to prepare teachers.

Note on Sources: In the preparation of this talk, detailed citations from college catalogues, archival documents, and interviews have not consistently been provided. These citations appear in the dissertation from which this paper was drawn.